Appln No. 09/699,031 Amdt date November 20, 2003 Reply to Office action of July 17, 2003

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the final Office action of July 17, 2003. Claims 1-3, 11, and 22 have been amended. Claims 1-7, 11, 13, 14, 16, and 22-25 are pending in the application. Applicant thanks the Examiner for attending to the application.

Applicant filed a response to the final Office action on September 17, 2003. An Advisory Action was mailed on October 20, 2003. In the Advisory Action, the Examiner maintains the rejection of claims 1-7, 11, 13, 14, 16, and 22-25. This Amendment is filed with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner maintains the rejection of claim 1 over Fultz. The Advisory Action states:

Fultz discloses a system allowing a user from the Mobil computer inquires to a base station as the external server to retrieve the navigation information and other resources (col. 7, lines 65-67 and col. 8, lines 1-5). The computer at the user is the client-server architecture that allow the user to request and transmitted the request to base station. The information is retrieved and transferred back to the Mobil as remote computer system (col. 10, lines 22-58). See Advisory Action Attachment.

Claim 1, as amended, has been clarified to indicate that claim 1 is to a method, using a personal computer device. The method includes, inter alia, "requesting, by the personal computer device...; receiving, by the personal computer device...; and providing, by the personal computer device, the information to a remote computer system..." Accordingly, it does not appear that the comments regarding claim 1 apply. Claim 1 therefore

Appln No. 09/699,031 Amdt date November 20, 2003 Reply to Office action of July 17, 2003

appears allowable. Claims 2-7, depending on claim 1, also therefore appear allowable over Fultz.

For independent claim 11 the Advisory Action states "the target profiles in Herz is a set of profiles utilizing for searching for the targets of objects. Since the claim do not differentiate from a standard profile and other profiles. One of the Herz's multiple profile is a standard profile as the application claimed." See Advisory Action Attachment.

Independent claim 11, as amended, specifies "the multiple profiles including a profile including information about the user and a standard profile, the standard profile being a standardized profile made available for selection by the user . . . " Thus, claim 11, as amended, differentiates a standard profile from other profiles. Accordingly, claim 11 appears to be allowable over Herz. In addition, claims 13, 14, and 16, depending on claim 11, also therefore appear allowable over Herz.

Regarding independent claim 22, the Advisory Action states "although the applicant pointed out to the examiner that the specification defining how the copied profile constructed and operates; However, the copied profile was not defined in that way in the context of claim 22." See Advisory Action Attachment.

Independent claim 22, as amended, specifies "the multiple profiles including a profile including information about the user and a copied profile, the copied profile being, when created, a copy of another profile associated with the user..."

Thus, claim 22, as amended, defines the construction of the copied profile. Accordingly, claim 22 appears to be allowable

Appln No. 09/699,031

Amdt date November 20, 2003

Reply to Office action of July 17, 2003

over Herz. In addition, claims 23-25, depending on claim 22, also therefore appear allowable over Herz.

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of the application and allowance of claims 1-7, 11, 13, 14, 16, and 22-25 are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

y // 2

Daniel M. Cavanagh

Reg. No. 41,661 626/795-9900

DMC/rmw RMW IRV1071864.1-\*-11/20/03 4:27 PM